

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Joint Application of Frontier Communications Corporation, Frontier Communications of America, Inc. (U 5429 C) Verizon California Inc. (U 1002 C), Verizon Long Distance, LLC (U 5732 C), and Newco West Holdings LLC for Approval of Transfer of Control Over Verizon California Inc. and Related Approval of Transfer of Assets and Certifications.	Application 15-03-005 (Filed on March 18, 2015)
---	--

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO
CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 15-12-005**

Intervenor: Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 15-12-005
Claimed: \$78,304.75	Awarded: \$78,236.62
Assigned Commissioner: Catherine J.K. Sandoval	Assigned ALJ: Karl Bemesderfer

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	The Decision grants the Application of Frontier and Verizon to transfer wireline assets subject to conditions, and it approves related settlements.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	June 10, 2015	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	July 9, 2015	Verified

4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.15-07-009	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 20, 2015	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.15-07-009	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 20, 2015	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.15-12-005	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 9, 2015	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 8, 2016.	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	The deadline for filing a compensation request is 60 days after the issuance of a Final Decision. Because the 60 th day falls on Sunday, February 7, this filing on Monday, February 8 2016 is timely.	

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).**

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. CforAT’s overall position in this proceeding was to address whether the proposed transfer would be beneficial to the	CforAT’s Protest to Application, filed on April 27, 2015 at pp. 2-3. The conditions proposed by CforAT in conjunction with the transaction were summarized by the Commission in the	

<p>community of customers with disabilities and to address potential mitigation measures that would reduce the risk of harm from the proposed transfer on this vulnerable class of customers who may be at unique risk from the impacts of the proposed merger due to their unique characteristics. The specific issues of concern to customers with disabilities and addressed by CforAT are set out in greater detail below.</p>	<p>D.15-12-005 (the Final Decision) at pp. 17-18. Each of the issue areas of concern to CforAT based on their impact on our constituency of people with disabilities were addressed through the Joint Protester settlement discussed below.</p>	
<p>2. CforAT addressed the issues of concern to our constituency through discovery and individual settlement efforts with Applicants. CforAT also participated actively in the evidentiary hearing addressing the state of the network, and in the subsequent briefing. Eventually, CforAT joined with ORA and TURN (collectively referred to in the Final Decision as the Joint Protestors) to enter into a settlement with Frontier. This settlement addressed all issues raised by CforAT, as discussed below.</p>	<p>Final Decision at p. 7 (describing the settlement in the procedural history of the docket, and noting that it is attached to the decision as Appendix F), pp. 57-59 (describing the settlement in greater detail), p. 74-75 (requiring Frontier to implement settlement and specifying that the Commission will enforce its terms) and Appendix F. The Commission specifically noted that it “relies on various conditions and requirements set forth herein, including the various settlements and MOUs and the Joint Application, to ensure proper allocations of long-term and short-term benefits to ratepayers...” Final Decision at p. 48.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p>3. Throughout this proceeding, CforAT has been the sole party addressing issues of disability access, particularly accessible customer communications.</p>	<p>The settlement entered into by the Joint Intervenors and approved by the Commission includes improvements in accessible communications. See Settlement Agreement, para. 26-28, Exhibit 1 to Attachment F of the Final Decision.</p>	<p>Verified. See Decision at 17.</p>

<p>This includes accessibility of applicants' websites and all standard print material provided to customers, as well as training for customer service representatives. See Final Decision at pp. 17-18 summarizing the issue as presented by CforAT.</p>	<p>CforAT addressed this issue throughout the proceeding and ensured that it was entered into the record. See e.g. CforAT Protest at p. 3, Testimony of Dmitri Belser on behalf of CforAT, entered into the record as CforAT-1, and attached discovery responses. See also CforAT Opening Brief, filed on October 5, 2015 at pp. 4-7 and CforAT Reply Brief, filed on October 15, 2015, at pp. 2-5.</p>	
<p>4. CforAT focused on the importance of battery backup power, particularly for customers who rely on their phone for assistance in emergencies and who might not be able to live independently without reliable service. See Final Decision at p. 18 summarizing the issue as presented by CforAT.</p>	<p>The settlement includes requirements for Frontier to address backup power requirements for new and existing customers, including supplying battery backup units at no cost as part of new installation of residential VoIP service and offering to sell backup batteries at cost to current Verizon customers; complying with the customer education requirements adopted by this Commission in D.10-01-026, and improving notices to existing Verizon customers. See Settlement Agreement, para. 13-14, Exhibit 1 to Attachment F of the Final Decision.</p> <p>The Final Decision addresses this public safety issue in greater detail at pp. 68-69, noting that the issue of battery backup power is addressed in the settlements and specifically calling out the need for compliance with D.10-01-026, an issue that was addressed in detail by CforAT. This issue is also addressed directly in the Ordering Paragraphs. Final Decision at p. 80, OP 8.</p> <p>CforAT addressed the importance of battery backup power throughout the proceeding, with particular focus on compliance with D.10-01-026. See e.g. CforAT Protest at p. 3, Belser Testimony at pp. 9-11 and associated data request responses, CforAT Opening Brief at pp. 14-18, and CforAT Reply</p>	<p>Verified. See Decision at 18.</p>

	Brief at pp. 2-5.	
<p>5. CforAT worked with other intervenors to address concerns about the state of the network, including participation on this issue at the evidentiary hearing and in briefing. Concerns about the state of the network tie closely with overall concerns about service quality for customers. See Final Decision at p. 17 summarizing this issue as presented by CforAT.</p>	<p>The Final Decision discusses the need for attention to the state of the Network at pp. 64-68. In particular, the Final Decision requires Verizon to make repairs and place funds sufficient to complete repairs that are not done prior to the closing date in escrow. Final Decision at p. 78-79, OPs 4-5.</p> <p>CforAT in conjunction with the other Joint Protesters also addressed additional issues regarding service quality. See Settlement Agreement, para. 6-9, 16, Exhibit 1 to Attachment F of the Final Decision.</p> <p>CforAT addressed issues of service quality and the state of the network at all stages of the proceeding. During the evidentiary hearing addressing the state of the network and the Network Report produced by Verizon, CforAT effectively helped to draw out the uncertainty regarding Verizon's level of investment in the legacy copper network which still serves a substantial number of customers.</p> <p>Examples of CforAT's input on service quality and network adequacy include: CforAT Protest at pp. 2-3, Belser Testimony at p. 4, Ev. Hearing Transcript at pp. 1020-1051, CforAT's Opening Brief at pp. 9-14 and CforAT's Reply Brief at pp. 5-9 (including importance of considering public input). In particular, CforAT recommended that Verizon should be held financially responsible for improving the network to current standards in order to ensure that Frontier's resources are not diverted from system improvements by the need to made remedial repairs. See CforAT Opening Brief at p. 11. CforAT also opposed Verizon's efforts to remove the relevant ordering paragraphs from the</p>	<p>Verified. See Decision at 17.</p>

	decision through comments, as described below.	
6. CforAT effectively worked in coalition with other consumer advocates and intervenors to address the need for available and affordable broadband service.	<p>The Final Decision discusses the importance of broadband access, including affordable access for low-income and vulnerable customers and customers facing emergencies, at various points, with specific focus at pages 51-54.</p> <p>The Joint Protesters' settlement addresses multiple issues regarding broadband deployment and affordability. See Settlement Agreement, para. 2-3, 6-7, 10, 17, 20-22, Exhibit 1 to Attachment F of the Final Decision. The joint protesters, including CforAT, also monitored developments addressing broadband as advanced by other parties, including the CETF settlement (which is directly referenced in the decision at p. 78, OP 2), and the need for CAF funding (which is directly referenced in the decision at p. 82, OP 12).</p> <p>CforAT specifically addressed the importance of available and affordable broadband as an issue with specific importance to the disability community, which is disproportionately impacted by lack of access to broadband. See CforAT Protest at p. 3, Belser Testimony at p 11; CforAT Opening Brief at pp. 18-20, and CforAT Reply Brief at pp. 10-11. This input supplemented the input of other parties and thus helped support the broadband commitments in the settlements and final decision.</p>	Verified. See Decision at 17.
7. Upon settling the substantive matters described above, CforAT worked with other consumers to support adoption of the settlement,	<p>The Proposed Decision approved the various settlements, but also included language that raised concerns about certain aspects of legal analysis and potential precedent.</p> <p>CforAT coordinated with the other Joint</p>	Verified.

<p>and to ensure that the Commission's analysis of the value of the settlement was appropriate. This included comments on the Proposed Decision seeking clarification of the analytical language in order to avoid future concerns based on the decision.</p>	<p>Protesters and sought clarification of the language of the Proposed Decision in order to mitigate these concerns. See generally CforAT Opening Comments on PD, filed on November 20, 2015.</p> <p>CforAT, in conjunction with TURN, also opposed Verizon's request to remove key ordering paragraphs. CforAT/TURN Reply Comments on PD, filed on November 25, 2015, at pp. 1-2.</p> <p>The final decision modified the language of the proposed decision consistent with CforAT's recommendations. See the redlined version of the decision issued on December 2, 2015 for changes, including p. 8 (clarifying the public interest standard for transactions), p. 49 (clarifying that the settlements, not the market, will ensure proper distribution of benefits), p. 51 (clarifying the analysis of the distribution of benefits), pp. 52-53 (taking notice of comments made at PPHs and removing language minimizing the importance of such input, see also pp. 64-65 addressing PPH feedback on the condition of the network), p. 63 (clarifying the procedural status of MOUs as compared to formal settlements), and p. 68 (striking language about comparative diligence between applicants and intervenors). It also retained the ordering paragraphs that Verizon sought to strike. Final Decision at pp. 78-80, Ops 4-6.</p>	
---	--	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions	Yes	Verified

similar to yours?		
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: ORA and TURN, generally had positions similar to CforAT's (CforAT, ORA and TURN collectively entered into a settlement agreement with Applicants as the Joint Protesters).</p> <p>At various times, CforAT's position also corresponded with additional parties, including the Greenlining Institute, CETF, CalTel and the Joint Minority Parties, all of which entered into settlements with Applicants separately from the Joint Protesters. Specifically, each of these settling parties agreed that some level of mitigation was needed for the proposed transaction to meet the required public interest standard.</p>		Verified
<p>d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication:</p> <p>CforAT worked closely with other consumer organizations to avoid duplication of effort where our positions were similar. By working collaboratively, including through joint filings and joint settlement efforts, the consumer organizations were able to present a stronger response than if the groups operated separately.</p> <p>CforAT prioritized our efforts on the issues that were most directly related to our constituency of people with disabilities, including efforts to ensure that the applicants directly addressed disability access issues such as accessible communications and an accessible website, as well as the issue of backup power. CforAT also participated actively on issues of shared concern with other parties, including service quality issues (including the state of the network) and support for low-income telecommunications options.</p> <p>Where issues were addressed adequately by other parties, CforAT stepped back to avoid duplication of effort. For example, in briefing, CforAT noted that "other intervenors will be addressing the requirements of Section 854 in much greater detail," and thus declined to provide detailed legal arguments, instead deferring to the arguments made by TURN and ORA. CforAT Opening Brief at p. 2. Similarly, in addressing broadband access, CforAT deferred to other parties on the extent of the Commission's legal authority and focused on the impacts of broadband access to our constituency. CforAT Opening Brief at pp. 18-19. Additionally, while CforAT supported the broad efforts to collect public input through a series of workshops and public participation hearings, we only attended the events held most locally in Santa Clara and relied on transcripts and feedback from other parties to review information from the remainder of the state.</p> <p>CforAT made comparable efforts to avoid duplication of effort in discovery. As described in greater detail below, we focused our unique discovery on issues of accessible communications and backup power, and relied on a focused review of discovery propounded by other parties to</p>		Verified

<p>address other issues of concern. CforAT did not request copies of all discovery responses, and only targeted issues that would impact our constituency.</p> <p>Finally, we note that our efforts to avoid duplication and proceed efficiently in representing the interests of our constituency required CforAT to work closely with other interested parties. To this end, CforAT reasonably engaged in ongoing conferences and coordination efforts. Time spent coordinating on issues of joint concern, as well as joint ex parte meetings and other activities, allowed CforAT to direct our focus where needed and assisted in overall efficiency and avoidance of duplication. CforAT submits that these efforts successfully avoided or minimized any duplication and no reductions should be made to the time recorded.</p>	
--	--

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
<p>The mitigation measures included in the Joint Protesters' settlement and approved by the Commission will provide substantial benefit to affected customers in general and to customers with disabilities in particular. These benefits are difficult to quantify in dollars, but will provide substantial assistance to people with disabilities. This includes Frontier's commitments to improve communications access for their customers with disabilities, including their website and their written customer communications. This also includes the commitments to improve implementation and education of backup power issues, which will increase public safety, particularly for customers with disabilities who are reliant on telecommunications service to obtain assistance in an emergency.</p> <p>Other benefits, including increased deployment of broadband and affordability protection for both broadband and basic service will ensure that customers have access to telecommunications services, including advanced services, at affordable rates. Again, while the actual savings to customers cannot be quantified since there is no way of knowing what rates would otherwise be charged, this element alone should result in savings to customers well beyond CforAT's expenditures for participation in this proceeding.</p> <p>Finally, the elements of the decision that require improvements to the network, including investments by Verizon prior to the takeover by Frontier, ensure that the network will be more reliable and that the</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>resources of the merged entity will go to providing benefits to customers, not to remedial repairs.</p> <p>Collectively, the value of these measures for disabled customers, even though difficult to directly quantify, exceed the cost of CforAT's participation in this proceeding.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>In our NOI, CforAT estimated that we would expend 150 hours of attorney time and 50 hours of expert time in this proceeding. In fact, we spent 161.5 hours of attorney time, extremely close to our estimate, and only minimal expert time developing testimony. This time includes work reviewing the application, identifying issues relevant to the disability community, pursuing discovery, developing testimony, participating in evidentiary hearings and briefing, pursuing and supporting a settlement, and engaging in appropriate ex parte efforts to support our position in the proceeding.</p> <p>CforAT participated effectively in all relevant aspects of the proceeding, including only selective participation in the multiple PPHs and workshops throughout the state. CforAT's work included discovery, testimony, hearing participation, briefing, settlement activity, ex parte participation, and comments on the PD. CforAT submits that this work was necessary and reasonable given the course of the proceeding.</p>	Verified.
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>In our NOI, we identified the issues on which we would participate as Harm/Mitigation (40%), Public Interest (30%), Jurisdiction (15%), and General Participation (15%). As the proceeding developed, this issues evolved, and our issue allocation is now documented as follows:</p> <p>Disability: This is a general category that includes time spent by counsel on the all of the issues identified as being of concern to the disability, as well as 100% of time spent by expert Dmitri Belser. The disability category includes issues of accessible communications, battery backup power issues, network quality/reliability, and broadband accessibility. Where entries could be directly allocated to one of these areas, they were individually identified. However, much of the substantive work done by CforAT, such as preparing testimony, included multiple issues. For the time grouped as "disability," CforAT estimates the split among the four substantive issues as follows: Accessible Communication: 35%, backup power: 40%, network quality: 10%; broadband: 15%. Because the single day of evidentiary hearing focused on network quality/reliability, this topic has the most dedicated time identified.</p>	Verified.

Collective time on disability issues: 40.2 hours (24.6% of time)

- General disability: 16.4 hours (10% of time)
- Accessible communications: 3.7 hours (2.2% of time)
- Backup power: 2.3 hours (1.4% of time)
- Broadband: 1.9 hours (1.2% of time)
- Network: 15.9 hours (9.7% of time)

Discovery: This includes time spent on discovery propounded by CforAT, which focused on the disability issues identified above, as well as time spent coordinating discovery efforts with other intervenors and ORA. In order to participate efficiently, CforAT reviewed the discovery requests propounded by other parties and selectively reviewed the responses where our interests overlapped. CforAT did not attempt to review all of the material provided via discovery to other parties. CforAT's unique discovery focused primarily on accessible communications and battery backup power. CforAT obtained information on network quality and broadband issues through review of discovery from other parties. This category also includes "procedural" time focused on discovery issues such as discussions of the NDA required to review confidential material.

Discovery time: 15.2 hours (9.3% of time)

Hearing/Briefing: This category includes time spent on procedural matters regarding the single day of evidentiary hearing (substantive time is identified as "Network" since the network report was the sole subject of the hearing) as well as briefing. As with discovery, CforAT's briefing focused on the substantive disability issues identified above. However the Hearing/Briefing classification also includes procedural matters, review of other parties' briefing, and matters that do not easily fit into substantive categories.

Hearing/Briefing time: 34.0 hours (20.8% of time)

Settlement: This category includes time spent by CforAT in conjunction with TURN and ORA pursuing the settlement that was eventually reached between the Joint Protesters and the Applicants, and adopted in the final decision. CforAT's time spent negotiating separately with applicants on disability issues is included above with Disability. Because CforAT negotiated jointly with other intervenors, it is not possible to separate out the time spent specifically on the disability-related matters included in the settlement. However, CforAT took the lead on negotiating these matters in the group discussions. Additionally, CforAT contributed unique information that informed the negotiations on issues that were relevant to all consumers (such as broadband and network quality) by presenting information about vulnerable customers who would be impacted by any potential agreement.

<p style="text-align: center;">Settlement time: 23.6 hours (14.4% of time)</p> <p>PD: This category includes time spent after the release of the proposed decision in this matter, including time spent preparing comments. Specifically, CforAT supported the adoption of the settlement by the proposed decision and also worked in conjunction with other intervenors to pursue clarifications of the language and analysis of the decision.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PD time: 18.6 hours (11.4% of time)</p> <p>General Participation: This category includes all time that does not fit into the other categories, including time spent on procedural matters (reviewing protests, attending the PHC, matters concerning the scope of the proceeding), PPHs (attending one, reviewing transcripts of others), reviewing filings by other parties, and coordinating with other parties. Because of the breadth of what it included in this category and the fact that there were numerous matters at issue overall in the proceeding which CforAT was obligated to track, even though we did not actively address them, this category is larger in this proceeding than in many other matters. However, CforAT's overall efficiency was not diminished (and in fact was enhanced based on our selective participation) by the time spent following substantive and procedural developments proffered by the Commission (such as PPHs and workshops) and other parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">General Participation time: 32.0 hours (19.5%)</p>	
---	--

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2015	163.6	\$450	D.15-12-046	\$73,620	163.6	\$450.00	\$73,620.00
Dmitri Belser (Expert)	2015	5.0	\$235	See comment below	\$1,175	5.0	\$235.00	\$1,175.00
Subtotal: \$74,795.00						Subtotal: \$74,795.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2015, see	15.0	\$225	½ standard hourly rate	\$3,375			\$3,375.00

	below							
Subtotal: \$3,375						Subtotal: \$3,375.00		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail		Amount	Amount			
	Postage	See attached spreadsheet		\$21.12	\$21.12			
	Print/copy	See attached spreadsheet		\$113.75	\$45.50 ^[A]			
TOTAL REQUEST: \$78,304.75					TOTAL AWARD: \$78,236.62			
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ¹		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation		
Melissa W. Kasnitz		December, 1992		162679		No, but includes periods of inactive status prior to 1997		

C. Comments on Part III:

Comment	2015 Rate for Dmitri Belser: The most recent rate approved for Dmitri Belser was \$230/hour in 2013. This rate was approved in D.15-03-038. Applying the 2014 COLA of 2.58%, as set in ALJ-303, to this rate results in an increase to approximately \$235 per hour (the exact calculation is \$235.93). No additional COLA was authorized for 2015.
Comment	Compensation Time: Because all merits work was completed in 2015 for this proceeding, CforAT is seeking compensation for time spent on compensation issues at ½ of counsel's 2015 rate, even though the compensation request is being filed in 2016. CforAT reserves the right to seek an increase in rates for work done in 2016 to the extent authorized by the Commission.

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
A	The Commission compensates printing costs at 10 cents per page for intervenors.

¹ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to D.15-12-005.
2. The requested hourly rates for Center for Accessible Technology's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$78,236.62.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Center for Accessible Technology shall be awarded \$78,236.62.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Frontier Communications of America, Frontier Communications Corporation, Verizon Long Distance LLC, Newco West Holdings LLC, and Verizon California, Inc., shall pay Center for Accessible Technology their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional telecommunications revenues for the 2015 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning April 23, 2016, the 75th day after the filing of Center for Accessible Technology's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D1512005		
Proceeding(s):	A1503005		
Author:	ALJ Bemederfer		
Payer(s):	Frontier Communications of America, Frontier Communications Corporation, Verizon Long Distance LLC, Newco West Holdings LLC, and Verizon California, Inc.		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	February 8, 2016	\$78,304.75	\$78,236.62	N/A	Reduced Costs

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Cfor AT	\$450.00	2015	\$450.00
Dmitri	Belser	Expert	Cfor AT	\$235.00	2015	\$235.00

(END OF APPENDIX)